UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
11th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 20 October 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 11th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)
later:	Mr. ELARABY (Chairman)	(Egypt)

CONTENTS

- General debate on all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61532 2200V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.11
12 November 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 65, 68 AND 142; AND 67 AND 69 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

Mr. HERNANDEZ (Dominican Republic)(interpretation from Spanish): First, Mr. Chairman, I should like to join other speakers who have conveyed to you and to the other officers of the Committee congratulations on your election to guide the work of the First Committee.

Last year, I said that we were beginning our work in an increasingly interdependent world at a time that is replete with false values, a time so dynamic that not even the most sophisticated means of communication could keep up with its rapid pace and so uncertain that not even the boldest analysts dare predict its course or its final end.

This year, as we begin the work before the Committee, the efforts made seem, unfortunately, insufficient, despite the recent progress resulting in part from the disappearance of the East-West conflict. We need greater political will.

Thus, an opportunity is now open to the United Nations to recapture the just ideals that inspired its founding : the maintenance of international peace and security.

Our delegation welcomed the merging in the general debate of the items on disarmament and international security. For several years now we have been emphasizing the fact that the gap between industrialized countries and less developed countries is also one of the sources of international insecurity.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that, compared to other regions of the globe, our Latin American region is a peaceful one, having as it does an exemplary treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, many of its countries, at an obvious disadvantage vis-à-vis their adversaries, have in recent times been

(Mr. Hernández,
Dominican Republic)

subject to humiliating interference in their current affairs but those who have committed aggression against them have never really been condemned by any international organization.

That is why, when speaking of disarmament and confidence-building measures and of international security, we should not forget that in 1959 the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution calling for general and complete disarmament under effective international control, thereby making general and complete disarmament the ultimate goal of all United Nations efforts in the field of disarmament.

In today's era, the question of general and complete disarmament remains utopian, and our challenge is now to unite all our efforts to reduce the level of armaments to the minimum.

In connection with a new world order - brought about by circumstances and not by the resolutions of an international body - we must find a formula or an element within the established system that will guarantee security for all. Obviously, those that have been in place up to now have not operated in a manner that is fair to all. We are in urgent need of a system in which we all are equal in word as well as in deed, not a system in which some continue to be "more equal" than others.

(Mr. Hernandez,
Dominican Republic)

It is outrageous that some countries see in the production of weapons for export a solution to their underdeveloped state, or a way of trying to balance their budgetary deficits or reduce their unemployment rates. They see in the export of weapons a legitimate, evident source of income which they need in order to improve their economies.

In the world in which we live, it is more urgent to produce milk than to produce guns or bullets, more urgent to build more hospitals and schools than to build missiles and sophisticated warships. There are many other, more humanitarian ways of putting an end to economic hardship. Development cannot be brought about for one people by exterminating others.

The delegation of the Dominican Republic, which is co-sponsoring the draft resolution on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, trusts that the negotiations on this Convention will lead to freeing us from that terror, which has benefited only a handful of merchants of death, to the detriment of all the world's population.

Concerning the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we also trust, as a signatory State, that during the Review Conference on that Treaty, measures will be taken to ensure that it is no longer a discriminatory document, calling as it does for non-nuclear-weapon States to be prohibited from possessing nuclear arms, while allowing the nuclear-weapon States to possess and develop them.

We reiterate our conviction that a more just Treaty is necessary in order to put an end not only to the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons but also to their possession by any State.

(Mr. Hernandez, Dominican Republic)

The problem of the arms build-up and international security is of concern to all of us, men and women of this world, nations large and small, the powerful and the weak.

The present nuclear and conventional military potential defies reason; it defies logic and proportion. Despite the crumbling of the Berlin Wall and the end of the East-West conflict, the threat of nuclear conflict, although never more than hypothetical, remains nevertheless a cause of global insecurity.

The "balance of terror" has been able to prevent - and only so far - a direct nuclear exchange at the strategic level between the super-Powers or a tactical nuclear confrontation in Europe between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the defunct Warsaw Pact, but it has not been able to prevent any of the more than 150 wars that have been fought in Asia, Africa and Latin America since the Second World War.

Neither nuclear weapons nor weapons in general can offer security to the world as a whole. If we were able to survive and to end the cold war, we should be able to destroy a peace that is based on terror. The "theory of terror" as a source of security is a false one. Weapons produce fear, not security. Fear is not the same as security. Security is synonymous with peace, and there will never be peace without disarmament and development.

Mr. TRINH XUAN LANG (Viet Nam): On behalf of the delegation of Viet Nam, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. I also wish to extend my congratulations to the other members of the Bureau of the Committee on their elections. I wish you and the Bureau great success in your work.

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

It is gratifying to note the interaction between international detente, the increase in international understanding, and disarmament. Viet Nam commends the agreement reached between Russia and the United States of America in June of this year, which built on the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START Treaty) and will lead to further significant cuts in their strategic nuclear weapons. We hope that further negotiations will be held and the other nuclear-weapon States will also participate in the process to accelerate the attainment of the goal of completely eliminating nuclear weapons.

After long and complicated negotiations, the Conference on Disarmament has finalized the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. The objectives of the Convention conform to the universal demand for the banning of this abhorrent type of weapon of mass destruction. The Convention itself is a significant contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security and the promotion of global disarmament.

At present the agencies concerned in Viet Nam are examining the contents of the Convention in order to make appropriate recommendations to the Government. While recognizing the view that the Convention cannot be totally satisfactory, as it must represent a delicate balance between many interests, we share the concerns of many developing countries over the financial aspects of the Convention, the unnecessary burdens imposed by the verification regime as well as the loopholes making possible the abuse of that regime, and the inadequate language on economic and technological development. And for reasons known to everyone, we are particularly concerned about the fact that the prohibition of the use of herbicides as a method of warfare has not been provided for in a main article of the Convention.

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

The demand for disarmament is deep-rooted in the international community's aspirations to peace and security, which are prerequisites for and indispensable to the success of its development endeavours. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament states in its paragraph 19:

> "The principal goals of disarmament are to ensure the survival of mankind and to eliminate the danger of war, in particular nuclear war, to ensure that war is no longer an instrument for settling international disputes and that the use and the threat of use of force are eliminated from international life, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations." (resolution S-10/2, para. 19)

The new characteristics of today's international situation have facilitated progress in some fields of disarmament, created more favourable conditions and required early solutions in some others. But the goals I mentioned earlier remain valid. Along these lines, in today's struggle for disarmament effective measures for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war continue to have the highest priority. We cannot support any argument that implies a diminution in the crucial importance of these measures on the premise of changes in international relations. It is an undisputed fact that nuclear weapons are not merely one among many types of weapons. They are weapons of extermination. For all the reductions that have been made, the world still must live with tens of thousands of weapons that have the capacity to destroy our entire civilization many times over.

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

The transformations in international relations and in the concepts of security reinforce the view that insistence on the possession or acquisition of nuclear weapons has more to do with power projection than with the protection of legitimate security interests. The impasse prevailing in the work of both the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission on nuclear issues is depressing. It is time to begin serious negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, to conclude the negotiations on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, to promote the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreement among the countries concerned, and to consider seriously the need to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

Viet Nam is a party to the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has signed a full-scope safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). We recognize the need to ensure compliance with the NPT and to strengthen the non-proliferation regime. We look forward to the success of the 1995 NPT Review Conference and are willing to participate actively in its preparatory process. But both the horizontal and the vertical aspects of nuclear non-proliferation command the adequate attention of the international community. We cannot accept any continued modernization of nuclear weapons. What is more, the prevention of their proliferation cannot be separated from measures aimed at the prevention of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament. The ultimate assurance against the proliferation of nuclear weapons lies in the complete elimination of this type of weapon.

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

In view of the rapid progress of science and technology, the prevention of an arms race in outer space has become an urgent task. The militarization of outer space and the development and deployment of space-based weapons may provoke a new chain of action and reaction, thereby endangering international security and hampering international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. The existing legal regime governing outer space is inadequate to forestall an arms race and check militarization there; further legal instruments must be negotiated to reinforce this regime. We urge that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space of the Conference on Disarmament be given a negotiating mandate to begin its work towards that objective.

Conventional armaments and armed forces have long accounted for four fifths of global military expenditures. Balanced conventional disarmament and the reduction of military spending will not only help reduce the danger of war but also release significant additional resources for development purposes. It is therefore in the interests of all countries to undertake conventional disarmament and reduction of military spending, and it is their responsibility to do so. The present-day international situation provides an opportunity for them to take such action. Over the last three years, Viet Nam has cut its standing army by nearly 50 per cent and substantially reduced its defence budget. We support efforts to curb the transfer of arms, provided that they are non-discriminatory and do not undermine any country's right to a sufficent national defence capability. We are convinced that the successful prevention of excessive military build-up and of the destabilizing accumulation of arms depends on overall confidence in inter-State relations, not just on the provision of information. We further

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

believe that in the field of conventional disarmament, the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States must assume primary responsibility, given the size of their arsenals and armies.

Confidence-building is an indispensable part of any strategy of disarmament, peace and security. Disarmament and confidence are always complementary. The experience of the confidence-building process in Europe, including its recent achievements in the military field, is valuable. Nevertheless, efforts to build confidence in various regions of the world can succeed only if they are based upon the characteristics of the regions concerned. In many regions, the lack of confidence derives mainly from political and economic factors. Viet Nam holds that it is now necessary and practical to elaborate further the political and economic aspects of confidence-building, particularly at the regional level. In this regard, as one of the original sponsors of the draft resolution on regional confidence-building measures based upon the Treaty on Amity and Co-operation in South-East Asia, which will be submitted to the Committee for consideration, my country wishes to express its hope for the widest possible support for this draft resolution.

Amid the changes all around the world, South-East Asia, a region that has undergone repeated wars and conflicts over the last half-century, is entering a new stage with fine prospects of peace and stability. Relations of good neighbourliness, mutual trust and understanding between the countries in the region are being strengthened, and the trend towards regional cooperation and integration for the objectives of stability and development is progressively gaining momentum. The accession of Viet Nam and Laos to the Treaty on Amity

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

and Cooperation in South-East Asia and their becoming observers to the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) constitute a qualitatively new development in the relations between the countries of this region.

Yet, to ensure durable peace and security in South-East Asia, certain issues remain, the solution of which requires intensive efforts of all the regional and other concerned countries as well as the support of the international community at large. In order not to lose the positive results of the peace process in Cambodia, all of the parties concerned should honour their obligations under the Paris Agreement on a Comprehensive Political Settlement of the Cambodia Conflict (A/46/608, annex) and strong pressure should be exerted on the party that refuses to abide by the Agreement. With regard to territorial issues between some countries in the region, Viet Nam advocates dialogue between the countries concerned with a view to finding appropriate peaceful solutions and urges that the countries concerned exercise the utmost restraint and refrain from any action that might undermine peace and security in the region. In this spirit, we therefore fully support the four principles put forth in the ASEAN declaration of 22 July 1992 concerning the settlement of disputes and the maintenance of security in the Eastern Sea (South China Sea).

(Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang, Viet Nam)

The changes in the world present us with both new opportunities and new challenges. We are confident that with the experience they have acquired from the past and their vision for the future, and in a greater collective spirit, the nations of the world will be fully responsive to the demands of the emerging new world. Viet Nam is prepared to play its part in the common endeavours of the peoples of the world.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of my delegation, Sir, I am pleased to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee of the General Assembly. Your well-known qualifications and wisdom, and your negotiating abilities are our sure guarantee that our deliberations will be successful. In addition, the fact that you represent our sisterly country, Egypt, gives your election special significance. Egypt, by its pioneering role in the region, is one of its pillars of security and stability. Our congratulations also go to the other officers of the Committee for the confidence placed in them. We wish them success.

The questions of peace, security and disarmament that are being discussed here in the First Committee assume more significance as we all work towards the consolidation of the new world order which has become a common endeavour for all countries of the world. This order, which is premised on and anchored in international legality, is based on and is drawn from the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The most salient features of this order are the consideration of justice, peace, development and respect for human rights, as well as the promotion of democracy.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Kuwait feels that development and progress in the world require first and foremost a stable international climate. Such a climate could be created only in the absence of the arms race that started in past decades and, regrettably, became an end in itself. Quite frequently, that race led to the unreasonable stockpiling of armaments which gave some irresponsible regimes an appetite for aggression and hegemony and seduced them into threatening to use force, or into using it to satisfy greedy ambitions.

History has taught us that the following elements are essential for the maintenance of international peace: first, respect for the sovereignty of all States, irrespective of size; secondly, international relations should be based on a foundation of equality and justice; thirdly, common solutions to bilateral regional and international problems should be reached by peaceful means; fourthly, mutual respect for the territorial integrity and borders of all States; fifthly, the inadmissability of the invasion or the annexation of the territory of any country by another, and sixthly, the security of all States is an intertwined fabric, irrespective of size or capabilities.

In underscoring these elements as essential for world peace, Kuwait proceeds from the bitter experience of the Iraqi aggression and occupation of its territory - which aggression was repulsed by international legality in its strongest form, in defence, not only of a State or a people, but of a principle that forms the stanchion of world peace and security.

We hope that the world has drawn adequate lessons from our experience. However, it is regrettable that the aggressor continues to refuse to comply with all Security Council resolutions relating to its aggression against Kuwait. More serious still is the fact that the aggressor has started again

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

to renew its false claims with regard to Kuwait, as if the Iraqi regime has not been content with what its policies have done to its own people, and to the stability of the region and to world peace.

We fully support the efforts of the Special Commission in regard to the inspection of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. We hope that the task of this Commission will reinforce once again an important principle, namely that it is important and necessary for the international community to engage in the common pursuit of seeking out such weapons, preventing their stockpiling and getting rid of them.

The region of the Arabian Gulf, being engaged as it is in reconstruction and in trying to consolidate security and stability, deter aggression and cut the aggressor down to size, views with great concern the recent developments regarding the islands of Abu Musa, Greater Tunb and Lesser Tunb, whose international sovereignty belongs to the State of the United Arab Emirates. While reemphasizing that just concept we call upon the friendly Islamic Republic of Iran to reach a peaceful solution to its dispute with the United Arab Emirates on a basis of legality and respect for treaties and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. We trust that the two parties to the dispute, given their record in terms of respect for treaties and charters, and their concern for sparing their two countries and the whole region anything that may threaten stability, will be able to reach a solution that may ensure rights and underscore obligations for both parties.

While it follows the current positive developments, especially in the case of the major Powers and in the area of reduction of nuclear weapons, together with the tendency to eliminate such weapons, Kuwait would like to

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

draw attention to the need to take the necessary steps to prevent proliferation and to prevent the transfer of such weapons, their components, or the know-how and technicians needed for the manufacture of these lethal weapons to nations which have the will to acquire them. There are examples of this in the Middle East region, the most outstanding of which being Israel. Proceeding from this, Kuwait supports the non-proliferation Treaty and calls upon all countries to accede to it, and also calls upon the Review Conference on the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty to be held in 1995 to reach a formula that would make it universal and thereby subject all nuclear installations to the effective safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Kuwait also calls for the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests in order to put an end to the grave threats the development of these destructive weapons continues to pose and to spare the environment the harmful results of nuclear tests.

Kuwait reiterates its absolute support for the establishment of a nuclear free zone in the Middle East. We feel that Israel should accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and should agree to subject its installations to mandatory international supervision in order to remove all suspicion and causes of tension from the region.

Israel's uncontrolled and unmonitored nuclear armaments fuel the perpetuation of the state of instability in the region and prevent its countries from channelling their resources to human and economic development. We welcome the peace talks on the Middle East, the seventh round of which starts tomorrow in Washington, as a positive step towards achieving stability. We call upon Israel not to waste this opportunity and urge it to respond positively to the principle of land-for-peace and to implement Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). We are convinced that early political and just solution to the Middle East conflict, with its core, the question of Palestine, is an essential prerequisite of peaceful coexistence in this highly sensitive region of the world. Therefore, we believe that, as far as our region is concerned, any regional disarmament proposals should take into account the security of all peoples and States in the region in a manner that would secure peace for all States and prevent aggression under any pretext.

World attention is now focused on the proliferation of other weapons of mass destruction. A case in point is chemical and biological weapons whose

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

delivery systems in the form of long-range or intermediate-range rockets have also proliferated. This unprecedented proliferation of weapons of mass destruction makes it necessary that the issue be addressed in all seriousness in the framework of the United Nations. Additionally, new and more effective methods of verification should be developed and used against those who may try to circumvent systems of verification.

Therefore, Kuwait supports the growing international determination to put into effect the chemical weapons Convention. The Convention will be the subject of a draft resolution that will be discussed in the Committee. While we support the Convention's noble goals, we hope that all weapons of mass destruction will be addressed in an overall manner on the basis of equality, justice and of ensuring security for all States of the world without distinction. Therefore, we call for mandatory compliance with the chemical weapons Convention provided there is the same degree of compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and also to ensure that chemical weapons will not spread and that their installations are subjected to inspection and monitoring.

Perhaps for the first time this century, we live in an era when swords are being beaten into ploughshares. We can safely say that the current changes in different parts of the world are welcome, but in the face of future challenges we have to be vigilant for we no longer have any right to return to the old state of tensions. If we fail to make good use of our potential for creative work in a collective manner, we may bring upon ourselves serious consequences. But through collective action and through the efforts of the United Nations, we can rekindle humanity's hope.*

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Belarus) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation would like first of all to associate itself with the congratulations which have been offered to our Chairman on his election to guide the work of Chairman of the First Committee. We are sure that your experience, including your experience at Geneva, will make for success in your difficult task.

Less than a year has passed since the USSR ceased to exist. For us in Belarus these months have been months of hard work to give concrete effect to the radically new political status of Belarus.

During the general debate in the First Committee in 1991, the delegation of Belarus spoke about its country's new national goals and interests. Today, we are ready to report also on certain results of our progress along our new path.

One of the major foreign policy goals of Belarus, which is enshrined in our Constitution, is to achieve non-nuclear status. In this context, the Belarus delegation would like to inform the Committee that the removal of all tactical nuclear weapons from the territory of Belarus was completed ahead of schedule in April of this year. In May, the signing of the Lisbon Protocol to the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START Treaty) resolved the problem of succession with regard to the Treaty, and Belarus became a party to it, together with Kazakhstan, Russia, Ukraine and the United States. During the debate, many delegations quite rightly welcomed the signing of that important instrument, which opened the way for the ratification of the START Treaty. Belarus is to ratify the Treaty at the parliamentary session opening today at Minsk.

In connection with the Lisbon Protocol, Belarus has undertaken to remove all strategic offensive weapons from its territory within seven years, by 1999. The feasibility of shortening that period is currently being explored.

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

Belarus does not intend to carry out the destruction of the nuclear weapons on its soil. The significance of that factor in terms of accelerating the removal schedule and in terms of non-proliferation of nuclear-weapon technologies is self-evident.

On 20 July of this year Belarus signed an agreement with Russia to place all strategic offensive weapons remaining in our territory under Russian jurisdiction. Thus, our relationship to that potential was reduced to the absolute minimum. At the same time, the agreement whereby Belarus has the right to forbid the use of nuclear weapons from its territory remains in force, and the necessary technical procedures for that purpose are being established.

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

As members know, two years ago, in 1990, Belarus proposed from the rostrum of the General Assembly the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free belt from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea embracing a number of States in that area. At that time the idea was not universally viewed as feasible. Now, in the light of developments in our country and in those of our neighbours to the North-West, West and South, the nuclear-weapon-free belt is beginning to take shape and has a genuine chance of becoming reality.

At the time of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Independent States, Belarus committed itself to becoming a non-nuclear party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). That commitment was confirmed in the Lisbon Protocol. It is expected that the decision to accede to the NPT will be adopted at the forthcoming session of the Belarus Parliament. We consider the NPT to be the basis of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime, and we firmly support extending the Treaty indefinitely at the 1995 Review Conference.

Now that Belarus is an independent State, we are beginning to sense more keenly the threat posed by the proliferation of dangerous military technologies. We do not relish the prospect of finding ourselves by the end of the century within a number of overlapping circles on the map that reflect the ranges of ballistic missiles from various sources - particularly now, when we are no longer a part of a super-Power. Belarus therefore has an active interest in strengthening all non-proliferation regimes.

Since we possess a developed military-industrial potential, we are also aware of our own responsibilities in this domain. In that connection, the Government of Belarus adopted at the end of August a decision to establish

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

a national system for effective control and regulation of exports of military and dual-purpose goods, services and technologies. The Government has prohibited the export of weapons, munitions, military equipment and related goods and services to areas of military conflict and to politically unstable regions. Also prohibited are the re-export of exported weapons and their use outside the territory of the importing State without the consent of the Government of Belarus.

As it steps out from under the nuclear umbrella, Belarus is making a full review of the principles for ensuring its national security. We have enshrined the goal of neutrality in our Constitution, and we are steadily moving towards that goal. Belarus stands by its policy of not joining military-political alliances and not becoming a party to other agreements providing for similar relationships.

Accordingly, Belarus is vitally interested in strengthening security and promoting the processes of disarmament both on the European continent and world wide. Belarus's concept of national security, now being formulated, is based largely on the need to achieve and maintain positive stability in the region around us.

In creating its own national army to take the place of the powerful contingents of the Soviet army once stationed on our soil, Belarus is guided by the principle of minimal sufficiency and minimal deterrence. In that context, we attach great importance to the implementation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty) and to further progress towards the reduction of armed forces in Europe.

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

From the very beginning of the negotiations among the eight States successors to the former Soviet Union in the area of application of the CFE Treaty, the Republic of Belarus has had a sufficiently clear vision of its needs, determined by the necessity of reducing the troop contingents present in the territory of the Republic. As a result of intensive work by the eight States, an agreement on principles and means for the implementation of the CFE Treaty was drawn up and was signed, together with the relevant protocols, on 23 May at Tashkent. Those documents made possible the entry into force of the Treaty, which is rightly viewed as the cornerstone of the security system in Europe.

Having committed itself to complying with the CFE Treaty on the basis of an interim arrangement, Belarus intends to ratify the Treaty in the course of the forthcoming session of its Parliament, thereby facilitating its final entry into force. In conformity with the CFE 1A agreement on the troop strength of conventional armed forces in Europe, the armed forces of Belarus will number no more than 100,000 troops 40 months after the CFE Treaty enters into force.

This year Belarus became a full member of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and signed the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris for a New Europe. We also became a party to the Vienna Document of 1992 and the Open Skies Treaty. As a member of CSCE, the Republic of Belarus has already adopted, together with other States, a document of our new times: the Declaration of the Helsinki Summit.

In the domain of security, those documents lay out a concentrated programme of further action to increase the transparency and predictability of

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

military activities and to establish a system of collective security measures. The programme combines the wisdom of various approaches to these sensitive issues and sets new frontiers for concerted action.

Thus, the Republic of Belarus is today a party to practically all European instruments in the sphere of disarmament and arms control.

We intend to comply in good faith with all of the international obligations we have undertaken. For that purpose Belarus created in June of this year the National Agency for Verification and Inspections, which is to provide the necessary support for all international procedures to ensure compliance with treaties on disarmament and confidence-building. Belarus was the first among the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States to create an agency of that kind.

We hope that States which have experience in carrying out such procedures and in the relevant technology will assist us in organizing the work of the Agency and in ensuring appropriate interaction between the Agency and its counterparts in other countries.

I also wish to state that recently, at Minsk, three agreements between Belarus and the United States of America on cooperation in the military sphere for the purpose of facilitating the processes of disarmament and arms control were initialed. We expect those agreements to be signed within the next few days, probably the day after tomorrow, on Thursday of this week.

At the summit meeting at Bishkek, where the Heads of State or Government of the Commonwealth of Independent States met on 9 October, Belarus became a party to agreements among the States successors to the former Soviet Union on the implementation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF Treaty) and the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty) in respect of their national territories and taking into account their national interests. It is envisaged that appropriate agreements with the United States on legal succession in respect of those Treaties will be concluded.

At the summit meeting of the Commonwealth of Independent States, a joint consultative commission on disarmament was established. One of the primary goals of the commission is to ensure interaction among the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States in complying with international agreements.

In a broader multilateral context, the delegation of Belarus wishes to express its profound satisfaction at the successful completion by the Conference on Disarmament of the draft Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. In many ways, that Convention is an unprecedented instrument. Belarus has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1, by which the General Assembly would endorse the chemical weapons Convention. Belarus, in whose territory chemical weapons were used during the First World War, will in due course consider signing the Convention and undertaking the obligations it implies. The entry into force of the chemical-weapons Convention will outlaw another monstrous weapon of mass destruction.

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

As is known, Belarus has worked in the General Assembly for many years to secure a prohibition of the creation of new types of weapons of mass destruction. At the coming forty-eighth session of the General Assembly, we intend to submit a follow-up draft resolution on the subject in order to establish agreed international procedures to achieve that goal. We hope to take another step forward in that process and achieve consensus. All the necessary circumstances for it seem to be in place.

For the first time in many years, the situation is also favourable for the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The moratorium on nuclear testing on the part of three States - Russia, France and the United States - seems to provide the foundation for a decisive breakthrough to the full destruction of such weapons. If the two other nuclear States were to join in the moratorium and it were extended until the conclusion of a total ban on nuclear explosions, that would be precisely the scenario that would meet the aspirations of the rest of the international community, be in keeping with the spirit of the times and - a matter of great importance - promote the indefinite extension of the non-proliferation Treaty in 1995.

As is known, in 1991 Belarus submitted to the Conference on Disarmament an official request to be admitted as a full member. The international obligations assumed since then by Belarus in the disarmament field and its new active role in nuclear and conventional disarmament constitute, it seems to us, additional arguments in favour of that request, which we take this opportunity to confirm today.

Having entered on an equal footing into the family of sovereign States, Belarus firmly intends to be a civilized member of it from the outset. Our delegation hopes that this brief survey of Belarus's activities in recent months - both unilaterally and through accession to major international

(Mr. Martynov, Belarus)

instruments - unequivocally attests to that fact. Belarus not only cherishes the rights of a sovereign State, but also embraces with the greatest sense of responsibility the obligations of a member of the international community.

Mr. RAKOTOZAFY (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): As my delegation is speaking before the Committee for the first time, I should like to extend to Mr. Elaraby the warm congratulations of the delegation of Madagascar on his unanimous election to the chairmanship of our Committee. We are certain that, given his diplomatic talents, the Committee's work will be most successful. We also congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

Recent changes in international relations have greatly affected matters relating to disarmament and international security, which are the subjects of our debate. The end of East-West tension has not only brought about an enhanced role for our Organization - thanks in particular to the close cooperation between members of the Security Council - but has also helped to expand the concept of disarmament, which is no longer limited merely to arms control but now comprises the destruction of specific categories of weapons.

Certainly, the accomplishments of the past 12 months are modest, considering the contradictory trends emerging in the world. On the one hand, the pace of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Russian Federation are being accelerated by the unilateral disarmament initiatives and the signing of various nuclear disarmament agreements, in particular that which was recently signed at the summit in Washington, D.C., last June. On the other hand, the danger of the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, fostered by an enormous international transfer of those weapons and of their manufacturing technology, is exacerbated by the re-emergence of nationalism, xenophobia and extremism in

(Mr. Rakotozafy, Madagascar)

countries that are victims of open or latent civil war. Nor should we forget the capabilities of other nuclear States that are not yet participating in the present process of disarmament between the United States and Russia.

Furthermore, in order to avert the danger of a global military confrontation and to free the world from the nuclear threat, disarmament should no longer be considered in the context of East-West confrontation. To strengthen international security, what is needed is a global approach to every aspect of the question, in a multilateral framework, with the active participation of all States.

The draft Convention on chemical weapons recommended by the Conference on Disarmament for adoption by the General Assembly is a good example of this new approach. This unprecedented agreement, as its title indicates, is intended not only to prohibit the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons, but also the destruction of all existing chemical weapons and the means to produce them. Moreover, the draft contains strict provisions for verifying implementation of the Convention, and sanctions are even envisaged to ensure respect for the Convention.

There is no doubt that the chemical weapons Convention is a significant step towards the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and thus tends to hasten the achievement of our common goal: general and complete disarmament under international control. It is therefore a valuable precedent for future multilateral agreements on disarmament. That is why my delegation, which is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1, hopes for universal adherence to the Convention. The executive council that is to ensure the functioning of the Convention will have to assure its non-discriminatory implementation by promoting the transfer to developing countries of chemical technologies, material and equipment for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Rakotozafy, Madagascar)

The question of nuclear non-proliferation should also be approached globally and in a multilateral framework. To that end, my delegation welcomes the fact that, at present, all the permanent members of the Security Council have adhered to the non-proliferation Treaty and that more than 150 States are now parties to it. Before convening the Conference of States Parties to the non-proliferation Treaty envisaged for 1995, we should rethink the very concept of non-proliferation, since the present regime has been able to prevent neither qualitative nor quantitative proliferation.*

---

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Rakotozafy, Madagascar)

This again demonstrates the importance of bringing about a cessation of nuclear tests. Present restrictions on nuclear proliferation cannot be strengthened unless a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban Treaty is concluded. The moratoriums on nuclear testing decided upon by Russia and France, as also the recent law enacted by the United States Congress, are intended to limit nuclear testing, and they constitute positive measures that other nuclear-weapon States should follow.

The establishment of nuclear-free zones strengthens the non-proliferation regime and contributes to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. We welcome the success achieved in various regions in this area, particularly in the South Pacific and in Latin America, through the entry into force of the Treaty signed by Argentina, Brazil and Chile prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America, and by the strengthening of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. However, we regret that the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace has not yet been implemented, and we urgently appeal to all interested parties to work together to open up new avenues for the work of the Special Committee.

The enormous accumulation of conventional weapons constitutes an element of instability, particularly in areas in which regional tensions and conflicts pose a threat to international peace and security. The establishment of a Registry of conventional weapons by the United Nations is a novel undertaking that safeguards transparency in the international weapons trade. This initiative should be complemented by a study of the deep-rooted causes of the arms race in conventional weapons and all other categories of weapons. We should also avoid discriminatory practices that apply solely to one country or group of countries and should take into account the legitimate security needs of all States.

(Mr. Rakotozafy, Madagascar)

The Charter confers upon the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Close co-operation is therefore necessary among members of the Council to preserve the credibility of the Organization in the face of challenges. As the Secretary-General has aptly emphasized in his report "An agenda for peace",

> "A genuine sense of consensus deriving from shared interests must govern its work, not the threat of the veto or the power of any group of nations." (A/47/277, para. 78)

The participation and commitment of all Member States is necessary if the joint endeavours of the three main organs of the Organization are to enhance operational effectiveness in the field. It is also necessary considerably to strengthen the preventive aspects of the work of the Organization in order to foresee and avert conflicts. It is therefore important not to go back on anything that has been achieved so far, so that the present stage of transition can only lead to a new international realignment.

Mr. SAMHAN (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a great pleasure for me to congratulate you, on behalf of the delegation of the United Arab Emirates, on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee.

Your assumption of this important post is a sign of esteem for you personally and for your country, the fraternal State of Egypt. Your vast experience in many areas of international affairs will contribute to the achievement of our goal: the strengthening of international peace and security.

I wish also to convey our appreciation to your colleagues the other officers of the Committee and wish you all every success in your work.

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

The items before us are among the most significant on our agenda by their very nature, their particular importance, and their direct connection with the noble goals mankind aspires after with hope and optimism, in its yearning for a future of peace, equality, stability, security and freedom from the threat of weapons of mass destruction.

The future we all aspire after for a human race that has rid itself of the grave crises of past decades, should be built on a number of fundamental principles, namely: peaceful coexistence, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, prohibition of the use or threat of the use of force, non-admissibility of occupation of the lands of others, the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, and the right of every State to choose its own road to development. These are principles the United Arab Emirates has subscribed to since independence.

The building of peace is a historic task that calls for new percepts, especially in the area of addressing chronic problems. Side by side with this, we must all try to define the logical outcome of building preventive peace, that is to say the prevention of the eruption of crises which arise from economic, social and political causes, or which are caused by aggression.

To that end, we must strengthen the role of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, not only in maintaining international peace and security but also in promoting economic and social progress in creating a more equitable international economic environment and in settling long-standing conflicts with a sense of collective responsibility, by peaceful means, in consonance with the Charter and the fundamental principles that govern international relations.

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

We believe that the present overall picture of international relations indicates the presence of a number of positive possibilities for the world as a whole despite the persistence of some serious regional conflicts.

The aspect that is really encouraging in all this is that the cold war has ended and that the spirit of democracy is gaining the upper hand. Added to this, growing importance is being attached to the economic and environmental issues of the world. The practical measures announced by the United States and the Russian Federation to curb the nuclear arms race have been welcomed by the whole of the international community. We should like to encourage this kind of positive initiative, and hope that other States will follow suit, with the purpose of encouraging and promoting international confidence-building efforts at the regional and international levels so that regional tensions may be reduced, and disarmament and prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction may be strengthened.

We also subscribe to the view that general and complete disarmament should be accomplished under effective international control in order to create a propitious environment for international peace and security. We wholeheartedly support the conclusion of an international convention banning the use or the threat of the use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

We welcome the accession by China and France to the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), and consider this to be a positive step towards achieving full universality for the Treaty, as we hope that other States will follow suit.

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

In this respect, we support an important and effective role for the United Nations and its specialized agencies in dealing with the question of disarmament at the regional level. It was on this basis that we supported the General Assembly's resolution on regional disarmament adopted at its forty-sixth session. This approach, which became manifest also in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission at its last session, should be supported and reinforced by States that possess nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in order to achieve stability and lasting peace at the regional and international levels.

The draft Convention on the total prohibition of chemical weapons is a historic achievement in the context of the international endeavour to prohibit the spread of weapons of mass destruction. This achievement should go hand in hand with the elimination of other weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons. In this regard we are deeply concerned at Israel's possession of a horrific nuclear capability. The acquisition of this capability poses a most serious continuous threat to the security of the States of the region. Consequently, it is incumbent upon the United Nations as a historic responsibility, to request Israel to take appropriate and urgent measures that may lead to its accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and to request Israel to place all its nuclear facilities under the safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in accordance with the Security Council resolution 487 (1981).

We have already highlighted the importance of ridding all regions of weapons of mass destruction and of encouraging active international initiatives in that direction. There can be no doubt that our Arab region is one of the world's regions that greatly needs peace, security and stability.

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

Proceeding from this, we welcomed the ongoing negotiations between the parties concerned. We have even participated in the multilateral negotiations with the aim of reaching a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Middle East problem with its core, the question of Palestine. The settlement of the problem should be based on the two Security Council resolutions - 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) - and should involve a complete Israeli withdrawal from the Palestinian and Arab occupied territories, including Al-Quds as well as the Syrian Golan Heights, and the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights.

Our armed forces possess the conventional weapons that are necessary for self-defence and the protection of our frontiers, territorial integrity and sovereignty under international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the fundamental principles that govern international relations. We have set out this position in document A/47/370 that is before the Committee.

In many international and regional forums, my country has stressed the importance of settling differences and disputes by peaceful means and has reiterated its total rejection of the use of force. It is in this context that my country welcomes all the positive steps now being taken to strengthen international peace and security at the regional and international levels. Proceeding from this and with a view to ensuring security and stability in the Arab Gulf region, which sorely needs both, especially after the grave events of the last 10 years, including the Iraqi aggression and occupation of the fraternal country of Kuwait and the grave consequences to the region and to the whole world, my country, in cooperation with other fraternal States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council, has striven, during and after the crisis, to resolve problems and conflicts by peaceful means, through dialogue

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

on the basis of the Charter and the fundamental principles governing international relations. The overriding motive in all this continues to be our desire to maintain international peace, security and stability in the region.

Despite all this and notwithstanding the desire to strengthen relations between the members of the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Islamic Republic of Iran, we were very regrettably dismayed by the measures adopted by the Iranian Government with regard to Abu Musa Island in breach, both in substance and in application, of the memorandum of understanding signed by the two countries in 1971.

We have tried, through bilateral contacts and by negotiating with the Islamic Government of Iran, to reach a peaceful solution to the Iranian occupation of the three islands of Abu Musa, Greater Tunb, the Lesser Tunb that belong to the United Arab Emirates, with a view to restoring the three islands to their rightful owners, putting an end to Iranian occupation and restoring the United Arab Emirates sovereignty over the three islands.

The continued existence of this problem without any just and lasting solution, will perpetuate the tension and instability we are trying to avoid in the Arab Gulf region. In view of this, we must do all we can to restore security, stability and peace to this most sensitive of regions, which is important at the regional and international levels. Once again, we state our readiness to settle this problem by the peaceful means stipulated by Article 33 of the Charter, including litigation before the International Court of Justice.

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

This was confirmed by my country's Foreign Minister in his address to the General Assembly on 30 September 1992. We appeal once more to the Islamic Republic of Iran, a friendly country, to respond positively to our sincere and genuine wishes to reach a peaceful settlement of the dispute, as called for by our tolerant Muslim religion and the fraternal ties that exist between us.

The disarmament process must be closely related to the process of development and the strengthening of world security in its wider context. The continuing tendency towards disarmament which has resulted from the end of East-West confrontation and the reduction of international tensions should encourage us to move forward to settle all the remaining problems that face us. We should accord the settlement of those problems a very special priority and devote all our efforts to the achievement of peace and the common security of all.

The world we live in is in the throes of an accelerated period of transition and is undergoing fundamental economic, political, security, social and military changes. Therefore, the stand we should take vis-à-vis those changes, must not be confined to knee-jerk reactions but must develop into positive action to elaborate the ideas, percepts, strategies and initiatives that may enable us to exert direct and beneficial influence on the evolution of international events in response to the desire of the international community to live in peace, and to free itself of all threats and dangerous conflicts that obstruct the creation of a peaceful international environment of coexistence, peace and collective security.

The effects of the arms race and the attendant unbridled military expenditures are not limited to the creation of grave threats to peace and security. They also cause a massive haemorrhage of the economic resources of nations with all the damage that that causes to the world economy. It is high

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

time we rechannelled those wasted resources and devoted them to the achievement of the economic and social development of all countries, particularly in the third world. This can be achieved through disarmament, the reduction and control of weapons and military matériel and the strengthening of regional and international security on a realistic basis, in the interest of all.

To address these problems responsibly and realistically, is to find our way to comprehensive peace and to stable and lasting security. We all know that the world's problems, especially in the areas of disarmament and international security, are interrelated and interdependent. Therefore, we must work together to settle disputes by dialogue and peaceful means and to maintain peace and coexistence. Since most of these problems have acquired an international character, they cannot be dealt with by reforms or partial solutions. It is high time we began to work together to solve those serious problems and to formulate new, global solutions within the framework of the United Nations Charter and the tenets of international law.

By so doing, we shall have succeeded in freeing the world from the shackles of the serious problems that beset mankind, especially the problems arising from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. And then we can hope to create for ourselves a world of stability, justice and security for all.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

I draw the Committee's attention to the procedure to be followed, in accordance with established practice and the following decision of the General Assembly:

(The Chairman)

"Delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item.

"The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item.

"The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to five minutes." (decision 34/401, paras. 8-10)

Those are the ground rules, and I hope that they will be respected. I shall not read them out in detail every time, but I thought it advisable to do so on the first occasion the right of reply is exercised at this session.

I call first on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. MASSHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): With reference to the statement made by the representative of the United Arab Emirates, let me reiterate very briefly our overall approach on policy towards the Persian Gulf region and our neighbours in that area, based on the maintenance and promotion of friendly and good-neighbourly relations. We believe that only such an approach can guarantee stability in the area.

Having said that, let me add that from the very beginning the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran tried in earnest to resolve the misunderstandings regarding the situation of non-United Arab Emirate residents of Abu Musa Island. I reiterate that that problem or misunderstanding pertains to non-residents of the United Arab Emirates. To that end, and cognizant that the region's needs for tranquillity are greater than ever

(Mr. Masshadi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

before, and also that understanding and good-neighbourliness should govern relations between the countries in the Persian Gulf, we entered into negotiations with the other party.

We had hoped that the other party would reciprocate with such an approach and attitude, but the United Arab Emirates raised certain issues extraneous to the negotiations, issues that were totally irrelevant to the issue at hand, thus forcing the bilateral talks to a halt. Such an attitude does not lend itself to problem-resolution.

The Persian Gulf region needs security and stability, not tension, as was said, and we fully agree. Our brothers in the United Arab Emirates know that such claims would put the whole region in flames. We have to take every action with prudence and wisdom and in the spirit of good-neighbourliness and brotherly relations. Otherwise, the problems in the region of the Persian Gulf will not be resolved.

We have recently heard of border problems between Saudi Arabia and Qatar, and there are chronic issues between Saudi Arabia and Yemen as well. We are aware that there are issues between other countries in the region, which in the past have even given rise to bloody wars.

We should try to settle our disputes in a brotherly manner through bilateral parleys and talks. We are prepared to sit down with our brothers in the United Arab Emirates to settle the existing misunderstandings. Unfortunately, as I have said, the last time we did so the other side brought up extraneous issues without relevance to Abu Musa Island.

(Mr. Masshadi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

We hope that this will not happen again.

I have to make several points regarding the statement made by the representative of Kuwait. First, we agree about calling on both sides to respect the existing agreements between the two countries. We abide by the 1971 Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United Arab Emirates. However, it would be more advisable for the Kuwaiti side to call on both sides, not only the Iranian side, to settle their disputes through peaceful means.

Secondly, before calling on other parties to settle their disputes peacefully, the representative of Kuwait passed judgement on the issue of sovereignty. If one asks others to settle their dispute, one should not first pass judgement.

The third and final point is that when it comes to the names of geographical locations, we should use those that are used in the United Nations and that appear in centuries of literature; the body of water between us and our brothers in the littoral States of the Persian Gulf is called the Persian Gulf, and does not have the other names that have been used.

Mr. SAMHAN (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): I did not wish to take the floor, but I have to do so now because my colleague, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, has taken the floor before me.

Occupation is occupation by any name. It cannot be changed into something else. Iran's occupation of the three islands - the Greater Tunb, the Lesser Tunb and Abu Musa is a fact that is known to all. The three islands have been under military occupation since 1971. If the representative

(Mr. Samhan, United Arab Emirates)

of Iran wishes to acquaint himself with that fact, he can do so by perusing the relevant Security Council documents.

This is not an issue of a number of people who were expelled from the island of Abu Musa; it is much more than that. I do not think that any State would allow anyone to occupy its territory, no matter how small that State may be. The last meeting that was held in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates showed how desirous we are of resolving this problem by peaceful means. That continues to be our wish, as stated in the General Assembly by the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Emirates. Consequently, I am not going to dwell on this matter at length. The documents are there. And the documents prove beyond a doubt the historical and legal validity of the fact that the three islands belong, have belonged and will continue to belong to the United Arab Emirates.

Why then should Iran occupy the three islands and continue to occupy them since 1971 and why should the United Arab Emirates be compelled to have recourse to the Security Council? Does it stand to reason that a small State would claim for itself the territory of a larger State? What sort of logic is that? I again reiterate the United Arab Emirates' position: we have historical ties with Iran, and we are keen to preserve those ties. I daresay that this does not apply to the United Arab Emirates alone but to all the other States of the region. We all want peace to prevail and unless we maintain neighbourly relations, the Gulf will never enjoy stability, security or peace and will not be spared the repetition of the horrors and wars that have ravaged it over the past 10 years. Therefore, I again reiterate my country's position: we want to resolve this problem by peaceful means through the appropriate international channels, under the Charter of the United Nations.

Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran commented on the statement by the Ambassador of Kuwait in the First Committee. I think he was being rather selective here.

Let me read once again what our Ambassador said:

"We trust that the two parties to the dispute, given their record in terms of respect for treaties and charters, and their concern for sparing their two countries and the whole region anything that may threaten stability, will be able to reach a solution that may ensure rights and underscore obligations for both parties." (supra, p. 20)

That was an invitation to both parties.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Arabic): I now call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. MASSHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like first to express my sincere thanks for what the representative of Kuwait said. We are fully prepared to talk with our brothers in neighbouring States in order to settle some misunderstandings. But the issues that the representative of the United Arab Emirates mentioned are what caused the first round of negotiations, which were held in Abu Dhabi, to be halted: there are contradictions that the United Arab Emirates has not yet been able to resolve.

In the United Arab Emirates statement, it was said that Iran had violated the letter and the spirit of the 1971 Agreement between the two countries. We are committed to sitting and talking on the basis of the 1971 Agreement, but if we start talking and then extraneous issues arise, such as those mentioned in the statement of the United Arab Emirates, issues of the other islands and so on, then it is not we who violate the spirit and letter of the 1971

(Mr. Mashhadi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Agreement. It is simply that the United Arab Emirates does not know which subject it is talking about. If we are discussing the 1971 Agreement, then let us sit and talk about it, but not raise extraneous issues.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Arabic): I now call on the representative of the United Arab Emirates, who wishes to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. SAMHAN (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): There seems to be some distortion of the facts here. The agreement on Abu Musa Island is one thing, and the occupation by Iran of Greater Tunb and Lesser Tunb is another. Iran does not want to address the issue of its occupation of the Greater Tunb and the Lesser Tunb. Once again, I stress that the three islands - Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb and Abu Musa - are part and parcel of the territory of the United Arab Emirates and that Iran continues to occupy those islands. We are fully prepared to resolve this issue by peaceful means, through the application of international legal instruments and in the International Court of Justice.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.